

**ACTIVE CASES**  
**Analysis Jan 2006 QA Results for Food Stamps**

**Sample Size 77**  
(drops excluded)

**Totals for January 2006:**

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2006 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	\$11,584.00	14	\$ 1325.00	11.7%	5.2%
MILWAUKEE	5,476.00	9	885.00	16.2%	7.3%
BAL- STATE	6,108.00	5	440.00	7.2 %	3.7%

**ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:**

13- Agency Preventable Errors (APE)  
1- State/CARES Errors

**OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:**

Of the 13 Agency Preventable Errors, 8 were in Milwaukee, and one each in Chippewa, Kenosha, Oconto, Pierce and Racine Counties. He State error was in Milwaukee.

**TYPES OF A.P.E. ERRORS (13):**

**Earned Income (7)**

- Agency failed to budget a recurring shift differential payment (1)
- Agency failed to verify and re-calculate EI at review or application (4)
- Agency failed to correctly calculate average from verified info they did have (2)
- 

**Household Composition (2):**

- Agency failed to include a household member in the FS group after the addition had been reported by the customer.
- 

**Disability (1`):**

- Agency failed to enter disability into CARES when reported; thus the shelter cap was not lifted in the FS calculation resulting in under-issuance.

**Unearned Income (2):**

- Agency failed to budget Unemployment Compensation which was reported via alert.
- Agency failed to query KIDS to re-calculate Child support income at time of SMRF processing. (The customer had even reported on the SMRF that the CS had ended.)

**Other Expenses (1):**

- .Agency budgeted the MA deductible amount as FS expense, although much of this was not incurred.

**State “Error”:** Employer completed EVF by stating person works 40 hours a week regularly, plus 16 hours a week holiday. This overstates the income because the holidays were on regularly scheduled days, and also holidays don’t occur regularly. While the worker has an obligation to check before confirming, the employer error and the auto-population and EVF instruction process contributed to the error being created.

**WHEN WERE THE AGENCY PREVENTABLE ERRORS MADE?** One APE was made at application, four were made at review, nine at reported change (including SMRF).

**EFFECT OF SMRF PROCESS:** No errors found because of SMRF process for this month (excluding APE errors made by workers when processing SMRF).

**TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS:**

This month’s Milwaukee County error rate is double what the balance of the state’s is. Further the YTD rate in Milwaukee is double the balance of the state (7.3% compared to 3.7%).

This month shows a big number of errors made by workers regarding **earned income**. Most of these are just failure to do the things always expected at application and review: request and verify and correctly calculate prospective earnings. Many of these were in Milwaukee where this is the primary task of workers on their cases (now that the change center handles the reported changes portion).

Of the five “Non-Milwaukee County” errors, four were instances of **failure to act on changes reported**—household composition, Unemployment Comp., change in CS income.

**BIGGEST “CONTRIBUTORS”:** The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for January 2006 (including client errors):

**Milwaukee County, \$230 Agency Preventable Error:**

The client provided verification of maternity leave which also stated she would return to work mid-December. The income wasn’t budgeted prospectively for January/ The customer didn’t have an obligation to remind or re-report that she was returning to work. The agency had an obligation to use best information available at the time which was as the employer reported it.

**Milwaukee County, \$177 “State Error”:**

An EVF was completed by employer, reporting 40 hours a week plus 16 hours a week as holiday pay. So 56 hours a week were budgeted by auto-population. In reality the two days holiday pay the employer referenced were on work days so the employee only was paid for 40 hours. Also, holiday pay even if it had been over and above regular pay would never occur two days a week on a regular basis.

**Oconto County, \$150 Agency Preventable Error:**

On the SMRF the customer reported man moved in with her. Worker acted by sending “purchase and prepare” statement for signatures, on which they claimed he bought and eat food separately. However he is the father of the children in the household, and must be in the FS group. Over-issuance occurred because he is employed full time.

**Milwaukee County, \$149 Agency Preventable Error:**

The agency sent a verification request for new employment. When that did not arrive the case was never closed. The alerts that came as a result were not acted upon.

**Pierce County, \$101 Agency Preventable Error:**

The customer reported child had moved in. The agency took no action to add he,r so there was an under-issuance.

mbw 05/31/06